

Application Serial No. 10/618,955  
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

PATENT  
Docket: CU-3290

on page 3 of this paper.

**Remarks/Arguments** begin on page 5 of this paper.

Application Serial No. 10/618,955  
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

PATENT  
Docket: CU-3290

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2 and 5-6 are pending in the present application before this amendment. By the present amendment, Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added.

In the office action, claims 1-2 and 5-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0038442 (Kinsman) in view of the Admitted Prior Art (APA). The "et al." suffix, which may appear after a reference name, is omitted in this paper.

The examiner cites Kinsman paragraph [0034] and FIG. 9, the "raised lip 66" as allegedly teaching the claimed —extrusion— as shown in FIG. 2, element 26, of the present application.

The applicants respectfully **disagree**. It is respectfully asserted that the amended claim 1, as amended, is not taught or suggested by Kinsman or APA, whether they are considered in combination or individually.

First, the "raised lip 66" as clearly shown in Kinsman FIG. 9 is a recess or a deformity made to the sidewall itself. In contradistinction, the extrusion 24a as shown in FIG. 2 of the present application is an **extension** that is connected to the vertical wall. According to the presently claimed invention, no portion of the vertical wall of the sealing post 24 is deformed to create a recess. Accordingly, claim 1 has been further amended to recite:

—wherein **the sealing post comprise a vertical wall and** an extrusion **connected to a upper end of the vertical wall—**.

Application Serial No. 10/618,955  
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

PATENT  
Docket: CU-3290

In the prior art such as in FIG. 1 of the present application, the cap 5 is placed directly on the sidewall (such as 1) without utilizing the claimed extrusion (such as 26 in FIG. 2 of the present application). Kinsman teaches this prior art arrangement. In all Kinsman drawings, more specifically FIGS. 10-14, a "transparent cover 62" is placed on the entire upper area of the raised wall 26. This is necessary because Kinsman teaches cutting through the middle of the raised wall 26 to partition the substrate carrier 2 having a plurality of chips into individual package 70 as shown in FIGS. 10-11 and paragraph [0035].

Kinsman FIG. 9, which have been cited by the examiner, is just a slight variation of this different structure and still does not teach or suggest claim 1, now amended.

In Kinsman FIG. 9, the middle raised wall 26 will be cut through to produce a single chip package such as 70 shown in Kinsman FIG. 11. Thus, the single chip package 70 produced in accordance with Kinsman FIG. 9 will have one portion of the cap 62 being placed on the entire upper area of the raised wall 26 and another portion of the cap 62 being placed partially on the upper area of the raised wall 26 that is formed with a deformity 64.

In contradistinction, no part of the presently claimed sealing cap 25 is placed on any part of the top surface of the sealing post 24 (see FIGS. 2-3 and 5C-5D). Kinsman is substantially different from the presently claimed invention, which teaches that a sealing cap 25 sealing a single chip 30 is placed on the extrusion 24a (and not on the top part of the sealing post 24) connected to the sealing post 24. To clearly clarify this feature, the claim 1 has been further amended to include the following not taught or suggested by Kinsman

Application Serial No. 10/618,955  
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005


PATENT  
Docket: CU-3290

--further wherein the one or more sealing posts enclose the lateral sides of the single semiconductor chip on the PCB such that the extrusions connected to the one or more vertical walls are inside the enclosure--

This features of the presently claimed invention provide many significant advantages over the prior art as described in the specification page 2-3, one which being the reduction in the chip size (see specification page 3, lines 4-7). Accordingly, claim 1 is considered to have overcome the present rejection over Kinsman and APA.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-2 and 5-6, pending in this application, are in condition for allowance over the cited references. This amendment is considered to be responsive to all points raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and earnestly solicit an indication of allowable subject matter. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: August 16, 2005

William Park, Reg. No. 55,523  
Ladas & Parry  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300